The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. REDMOND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. REDMOND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. CLEMENT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CLEMENT addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in

the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. Kolbe) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KOLBE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the

Extensions of Remarks.)

## THE NEED FOR HATE CRIME LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on the front page of virtually every newspaper in America yesterday, I saw a story that sickened me when I read it and should shock every Member of this body. Matthew Shepard, the 21-year-old student at the University of Wyoming who was described by a family member as an incredibly caring person with a big heart, mind and soul, was lured Tuesday night from campus by two young men, driven a mile outside of town, bludgeoned with a blunt instrument and tied to a fence like a dead animal. Close to death, with his head battered and burn marks on his body, he was discovered 12 hours later by two passing cyclists who at first said they mistook his unconscious body for a scarecrow. Today, as we deliberate here, young Matthew Shepard is lying in a coma, clinging to life.

Why was this young man singled out for such a barbaric act of violence? According to all accounts, he was attacked simply because he was gay. This is the latest in a series of brutally violent crimes committed against people for no other reason than the color of their skin, their sexual orientation or

their religion.

For example, in southern Virginia last year, a soft-spoken black man was soaked in gasoline, burned alive, and then beheaded in the yard of his slayer. The victim was the only son of his parents, who were incredibly proud of his service in the Marines. He was targeted for this act of violence, it was discovered, simply because he was black.

Likewise in April 1994, two African American men murdered a white father of three in Lubbock, Texas. The killers later stated that they had set out to find a victim this time who was white.

Earlier this year in Illinois, a Hispanic family mourned the loss of their

son who was kicked and verbally abused as he lay on the ground bleeding to death, shortly after being in a car accident with the assailant. According to the authorities, the driver of the other car was upset that his car had been damaged and went over to the victim and repeatedly kicked him in the stomach while shouting, "Mexican, go back to Mexico."

And all of us by now have heard about the recent slaying in Texas of James Byrd, a disabled black man. The Nation was horrified to hear the account of Mr. Byrd who was offered a ride by three young men in a pickup truck. After luring him into their vehicle, buying him beer and driving him to a remote location, the men beat Byrd unconscious, chained him to their truck and dragged him around until he was beheaded.

Incidents like these underscore the need for Congress to move forward and pass pending hate crime legislation sponsored by my colleague from Florida (Mr. McCollum). We have a responsibility as lawmakers and as human beings to do everything in our power to punish those who commit hate crimes of any kind to the fullest extent of the law. But it is equally important for us to speak out loudly against those individuals and organized groups like neo-Nazis, white supremacists, and skinhead sects which target people based on benign traits like skin color, sexual orientation or religion.

Today we should all keep Matthew Shepard and his family and his friends in our prayers as we reflect on this brutal act of violence. If we are in fact to survive as a society, we have got to come to grips with these horrible, horrible crimes that are being committed around us, and we have got to teach our children different, we have got to set examples

The two young couples that disposed of the body of a baby in a trash can as they celebrated their evening prom continue to underscore how terribly weak we are becoming as a Nation and how careless we are becoming with facts and how we are not protecting each other from these types of acts of violence.

So, again I urge my colleagues to speak forcibly on this floor about protecting every human being on this earth. And we may have our differences, we may disagree on a lot of things, but to witness these kind of crimes being repeated and repeated and repeated, and allow them to go unchallenged, and allow it to be, well, because he was different, or that just happened because he was hanging out around the wrong types of people. Even the characterization of a legislator several years ago when he said, homosexuals are like gay bulls; they are worthless and should be sent to the packing plant. When legislators and people of authority start talking about other people like that, you wonder what impact it may have on average Americans who are sitting, listening.

□ 1600

DOING THE PEOPLE'S BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Spreaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for his thought-provoking remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to many different perspectives on this floor and in this chamber on this Sunday afternoon when we remain in session intent on doing the people's business.

Mr. Speaker, I was especially astounded to hear a lecture in ethics from the other side, particularly from one Member who finds himself ethically-challenged and, indeed, involved in civil litigation concerning what many would define as an ethical problem, and yet that is the level of absurdity we have reached in Washington, when those who are suspected of doing wrong often stand to claim their endeavors to be right.

So it is sadly, Mr. Speaker, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, where this morning our President met with leaders of the minority party, but failed to meet with the leadership of this House from the conservative majority. Indeed, in discussing with the leadership of the majority party the phenomenon, apparently this President has not met with the majority leadership throughout this two years of the 105th Congress.

Yet tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States will leave our Federal capital, intent on raising funds for electioneering. First he will go to Palm Beach, Florida, and then tomorrow night he will go to New York City. New York City? Yes, New York City. He will be there to raise money for a Member of this House who sits on the Committee on the Judiciary and who has aspirations of joining the other body here on the hill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand how hard bitten and cynical Washington, D.C. has become. Indeed, in stark contrast to my usual weekend activities when I am back home in position to listen and learn from the constituents of the 6th District of Arizona, I had the opportunity this morning to watch the various Sunday news programs, and came away from those just a bit chagrined by the ferocity of the spin cycle, and the seeming hunger on the part of the media elite to cast aside the Constitution and find some unconstitutional or extra-constitutional remedies for the plight in which our President finds himself.

Mr. Speaker, we should all remember, we stood here as a body 435 strong in January of 1997, raised our right hands and swore to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. Those in the Executive Branch take a similar oath. And for anyone in any office to suggest that we cast aside the Constitution and constitutional principles to embrace some remedies of

convenience, do our constitutional republic a grave disservice.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, I would call upon the President of the United States to cancel his questionable fundraising activities tomorrow, to stay in Washington, D.C. and to do something unique, indeed, novel: To call the leadership of the Congress and to join with Members of this House and the other body in constructive solutions to the challenges we face. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, let us state clearly, so there will be no doubt, we are prepared to stay here as long as it takes.

## COMMENTS ON CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the speaker who preceded me in the well waxed eloquent about the President of the United States leaving town for a short while tomorrow to do some fundraising for the Democrats, and he took great opprobrium to that. But I would remember twice in this Congress in the midst of the legislative session when the House went out of session, in the middle of the week, on a Wednesday at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, so the Republicans could get on corporate jets and fly up to New York for the largest fund-raiser held in the history of the United States. Their corporate buddies flew them up there. Wasn't that nice?

What is the result? The work is not done. It is not surprising. Congress has been in session 108 days working here in Washington, D.C. this year. The average American working for wages has put in 200 days so far this year, and they have gotten their job done, every day, day in and day out. Congress, having worked under the Republican leadership one-half as many days and being paid generously quite more, has not gotten its work done.

There is nothing for the President to sit down and talk to the Republican leadership about. The Republican leadership cannot even agree among themselves. On the House side they have tried to cut taxes by taking the money and stealing it from the Social Security trust fund. The Republican leadership in the Senate has wisely chosen not to go down that path.

The Republicans in the House passed a de minimis, not very helpful, but better than nothing HMO reform to give patients some little bit of rights, nowhere near what we would have done on the majority side or even some Republicans wanted to do on their side and were blocked by their own leadership. The Senate has denied that.

So there is no agreement between the Republican leaders of the House, the Flat Earth Society, and the Republican leaders of the Senate, those who are sometime in the era of Christopher Columbus and discovered the Earth is round, but not much further ahead of

that in history. They cannot agree. So how can the President sit down with a bunch of turkeys who cannot agreeing among themselves within their own parts I?

Yesterday when we were talking about the failure of the Republicans to do anything for education, smaller class size, more teachers, rebuilding and building schools across America, something that would be a real benefit to the American people, when we talked about the failure to do anything for patients rights, when we talked about the attacks on the Social Security trust fund, the chairman of the Committee on Rules jumped up and said, "That is right, but we have cut taxes."

Now, I would ask those who are listening today, are your taxes really lower than they were four years ago when the Republicans took power? In fact, the answer is no. The first returns on the 1997 Taxpayer Relief Act are in.

The results are striking.

Seventeen of the 80 percent, that basically figures out to about 14 percent of the people earning less than \$59,000 a year, got a generous tax cut of \$6. I hope you did not spend it all in one place. Maybe you put it away for retirement or the kids' college. That is great.

we go after the \$59,000 to Now \$112,000 bracket. They did a little better, \$81. But that is not where the money really went. Guess what? Twothirds of the taxpayer relief under the Republican bill passed last year went to people whose incomes average \$660,000 a year, and guess what? They got \$7,135. Now, the families struggling on a \$59,000 income got \$6. The families struggling, the Republican constituency, just struggling to make ends meet on \$666,000 a year, they got \$7,000.

But, don't worry, they will spend that money in a way to put Americans to work. Of course, the Republicans are against any increases in the minimum wage and they are following a trade policy which is driving down wages in America.

But they have done great things for the American people, great things, but they cannot get their work done here in Washington, D.C. They have raised a pile of money, and they want to go home and spend it to change the subject from what they have not done in Washington, D.C. or what they have done in killing HMO reform, in killing tobacco legislation, in attacking the Social Security trust fund, and what they have not done for education and what they have not done for average working families.

Shame on the Republican Party.

## FOREIGN POLLUTION AT AMERICAN BEACHES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague as somebody who owns a tax business in a working class neighborhood where not one client makes over \$100,000, I think it is fair to know that tax reductions for the working class people in this country are coming in the next few years, mostly because bipartisan negotiation put off a lot of those reductions. So I do not want to get into that. I am just meaning to address the fact that the partisan bickering has gone so far that people that would normally be outraged and would obviously never vote certain ways are voting ways totally contrary to what their personal belief is. It is either that, or they are just so busy fighting that they are not reading what is being proposed and what they are voting on. It is too easy to vote "no" against a Republican because he is a Republican, or vote "ves" for a Republican because he is a Republican, or vote "no" because he is a Democrat.

The point I am talking about is this summer, as a father, I was taking my children to our beaches in Imperial Beach, Southern California, and this is what we were greeted with, pollution signs that were closing our beaches and saying to children, you are not allowed

to go in this water.

I want you to notice that the sign is a bilingual language sign. That is for a good reason. I will explain it later.

The point being, was this a corporation that polluted our beaches? Why was Washington not doing something about it? In fact, this pollution problem has gone on for 20 years. The fact is the reason why it was not taken care of is not because it was a corporation, and I think my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would say they would be outraged if an American business was polluting the beaches so badly that children could not go in the water.

The real outrage about this issue was it was not an American business or citizens polluting these waters, it was a foreign government desecrating U.S. territory with sewage in such large magnitudes that it not only affects the environment so you cannot get in the water, but it is also destroying the largest estuary and sanctuary in the Pacific coast.

You can say wait a minute, Mr. BILBRAY, how could a foreign government actually be polluting and desecrating American soil? Let me just give you a little geography lesson here.

The San Diego-Tijuana Tijuana border happens to be cut by the Tijuana River. But, unlike a lot of rivers, the Tijuana River flows north into the United States

Now, that normally would not be a problem, except for the problem that Tijuana has been growing so fast, a lot of it by economic development, that the sewage lines are broken and are flowing into the Tijuana River, flowing through the Tijuana estuary and preserve, and going up into the surf zone for the United States.

Now, you understand, these beaches have been impacted for 20 years. Well, the Federal Government has told us,